	N REPORT			* 494	905 (90)
TO:			D	100	
•			26 August 1964		
			INSPECTION REPORT NO	· (If final)	, so state)
			ESTIMATED COMPLETION	DATE	
			15 September 1	മെര	
NAME OF CONTRACTOR				707	
Cerning Glass Works Type of COMMODITY OR SERVICE			-		-
Improved Rear Projection 8	creen				
THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE	I	•	THE CONTRACTOR WILL FUNDS YES NO	PROBABLY REI	MAIN WITHIN IS "NO" ADV
YES	NO		OMMENDATION AND/OR A	CTION OF SP	ONSORING OFF
PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED -			REVERSE HEREOF. IF DITIONAL FUNDS INVOL		CAIL MAGNITU
PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED	over)	)			
HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FIN					FROM THE CO
DURING THE PERIOD? YES THAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPE			details on reverse si	-	T YES
(If yes, indicate items, quanti				15 TERTOD:	L) '''
		INCEN	TIVES		
IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT	YES .	<u> </u>	NOTE:		
IF YES, CHECK TYPE		<del></del>	USE REVERSE SIDE FOR FINAL REPORT MUST CO		TIVE EVALUAT
COST AWARD PERFORM	MANCE DE	LIVERY			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			CE OF CONTRACTOR		
1. OUTSTANDING		PERFORMAN		TISFACTORY	
1. OUTSTANDING 2. EXCELLENT	4. AB			TISFACTORY	
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD	4. AB	BOVE AVERA	GE 7. UNSA		
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF	4. AB	BOVE AVERA	GE 7. UNSA		IDICATE
2. EXCELLENT 3. VERY GOOD	4. AB	OVE AVERA PERAGE INIMUM ACC IS UNSATI	GE 7. UNSA EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG		IDICATE
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.	4. AB	OVE AVERA PERAGE INIMUM ACC IS UNSATI	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG	CCEPTABLE IN	DICATE
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  1F OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF	4. AB	OVE AVERA PERAGE INIMUM ACC IS UNSATI	GE 7. UNSA EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG	CCEPTABLE IN	IDICATE
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.	4. AB	OVE AVERALITIES OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME	CCEPTABLE IN	IDICATE
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.	4. AB	OVE AVERALITIES OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME	CCEPTABLE IN NT PENDING ERFORMANCE	IDICATE
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED	4. AB	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG  DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Specif	NT PENDING ERFORMANCE	
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR	OVE AVERAGE INIMUM ACC IS UNSATI	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG  DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Specif	OCEPTABLE IN  THE PENDING ERFORMANCE  THE PENDING IN THE PENDING I	FOR'S PERFOR
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR	OVE AVERAGE INIMUM ACC IS UNSATI	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG  DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Specif	OCEPTABLE IN  THE PENDING ERFORMANCE  THE PENDING IN THE PENDING I	FOR'S PERFOR
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG  DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Specif	OCEPTABLE IN  THE PENDING ERFORMANCE  THE PENDING IN THE PENDING I	FOR'S PERFOR
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE. THE FOLLOWING:	A. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMENT  IS ON REVE  DER THE CO	EPTABLE  SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AND ED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Speciform Payme Series)  OTHER (Speciform Payme Series)  RSE IN NARRATIVE FORM NITRACT HAVE BEEN RECE	OCEPTABLE IN  THE PENDING ERFORMANCE  THE PENDING IN THE PENDING I	TOR'S PERFOR E include. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES	A. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE  SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AND ED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Speciform of the company of t	OCEPTABLE IN  THE PENDING ERFORMANCE  THE PENDING IN THE PENDING I	TOR'S PERFOR E INCLUDE. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES  DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS  PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER	A. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AND DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Speciform Payme Paym	OCEPTABLE IN  THE PENDING ERFORMANCE  THE PENDING IN THE PENDING I	TOR'S PERFOR E include. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE. THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES  DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS  PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER	A. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AND DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Speciform Payme See in Narrative form Payme See in Narrative	NT PENDING ERFORMANCE  ON CONTRACTIVED. THESE	TOR'S PERFOR E include. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE. THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES  DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS  PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER  END ITEMS  DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTORS	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR  PUT COMMENT BLE ITEMS UND	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AND DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Speciform Receive Payme Pa	NT PENDING ERFORMANCE  ON CONTRACTIVED. THESE	TOR'S PERFOR E include. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES  DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS  PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS  DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR  30 JULY 1968	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR  PUT COMMENT BLE ITEMS UND	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG  DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Specif RSE IN NARRATIVE FORM NTRACT HAVE BEEN RECE  ITEM  MANUALS FINAL REPORT SPECIAL TOOLING OTHER GOVERNMENT PRO	NT PENDING ERFORMANCE  ON CONTRACTIVED. THESE	TOR'S PERFOR E include. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE. THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES  DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS  PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER  END ITEMS  DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTORS	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR  PUT COMMENT BLE ITEMS UND	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AND DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Speciform Receive Payme Pa	NT PENDING ERFORMANCE  ON CONTRACTIVED. THESE	TOR'S PERFOR E include. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES  DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS  PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS  DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR  30 JULY 1968	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR  PUT COMMENT BLE ITEMS UND	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG  DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Specif RSE IN NARRATIVE FORM NTRACT HAVE BEEN RECE  ITEM  MANUALS FINAL REPORT SPECIAL TOOLING OTHER GOVERNMENT PRO	NT PENDING ERFORMANCE  ON CONTRACTIVED. THESE	TOR'S PERFOR E INCLUDE. W
2. EXCELLENT  3. VERY GOOD  IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.  CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED  CLOSE OUT  IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERAB APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:  ITEM  PROTOTYPES  DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS  PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS  DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR  30 JULY 1968	4. AB 5. AV 6. MI CONTRACTOR  PUT COMMENT BLE ITEMS UND	POVE AVERAGE  INIMUM ACC  IS UNSATI  RECOMMEND  TS ON REVE DER THE CO	EPTABLE SFACTORY OR MINIMUM AG  DED ACTION  WITHHOLD PAYME SATISFACTORY P  OTHER (Specif RSE IN NARRATIVE FORM NTRACT HAVE BEEN RECE  ITEM  MANUALS FINAL REPORT SPECIAL TOOLING OTHER GOVERNMENT PRO	NT PENDING ERFORMANCE  ON CONTRACTIVED. THESE	TOR'S PERFOR E INCLUDE. W

in January 1968, and the commencement of the present contrathe Contractor had accomplished some further work on discrete particle scatte screens for other Corning applications. Specifically, the scattering particle and been changed from aluminum oxide to ground glass and sample screens with separate abnorhing and scattering layers had been fabricated but the charactering have a sample screen with separate abnorhing and scattering layers had been fabricated but the charactering have been measured. These samples were displayed for subjective evaluation the inspector. (In the inspector's opinion, these samples were inferior to the inspector. (In the inspector's opinion, these samples were inferior to the inspector of products under the previous contract.)  The furnished as end products under the previous contract. The inspector should be directed toward in the Corning now considered that the major effort should be directed toward in the toring now considered in that this recommendation would be considered.  Subsequent discussion cantered on the Corning developed testing equipment the possibility of NPIC conducting operational subjective tests on future same screens developed under this contract. The inspector will coordinate the pretion of these tests will not involve the expenditure of Government funds but will be accomplished during the prosecution of routine tasks.  In answer to previous queries, the inspector advised of the ideal time to effort coordination with the rear projection vious annufacturer  b. The basic definitions and descriptions of the test equipment prosent Corning in their final report under the previous contract, were being reviewed our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the minds on the items and their application to the present contract.  c. If Corning believes a relaxation of screen specifications is require they should originate a written request for such action based on the knowledg gained by them in prosecuting the previous contract.  der Isolating the operating are	contractor's plant in Raleigh, North Carolina on 30 July 1966 for the purpose conducting the required periodic inspection. Contractor's representatives puring this visit were  advised that during the period between termination of the Contract  in January 1968, and the commencement of the present contractor had accomplished some further work on discrete particle scattering to the Contractor had accomplished some further work on discrete particle scattering applications. Specifically, the scattering particle and been changed from aluminum oxide to ground glass and sample screens with separate abnorbing and scattering layers had been fabricated but the character had not been measured. These samples were displayed for subjective evaluation the inspector. (In the inspector's opinion, these samples were inferior to interest that Corning new considered that the major effort should be directed toward vestigating and developing a lenticular screen. Accordingly, he presented a (unaddressed), dated 30 July 1966, containing such a recommendation. The instantiant of the considered discussion centered on the Corning developed testing equipment the possibility of NPIC conducting operational subjective tests on future samples were tests at MPIC on a nort-to-interfer basis. It is anticipated if these tests will not involve the expenditure of Government funds but will be accomplished during the prosecution of routine tasks.  In answer to previous queries, the inspector advised of the ideal time to effect coordination with the rear projection vice activation of the test equipment prosent b. The basic definitions and descriptions of the test equipment prosent countracturer  b. The basic definitions and descriptions of the test equipment prosent beaming in their final report under the previous contract, were being reviews our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the minds on the tests and their application to the present contract.  c. If Corning believes a relaxation of screen specifications is require they shou	NARRATIVE RI	EPORT	INTERIM	FINAL
the Contractor had accomplished some further work on discrete particle scatters cores for other Corning applications. Specifically, the scattering particle and been changed from aluminum oxide to ground glass and sample screens with separate absorbing and scattering layers had been fabricated but the charactered not been measured. These samples were displayed for subjective evaluation the inspector. (In the inspector's opinion, these samples were inferior to the furnished as end products under the previous contract.) then a that Corning now considered that the major effort should be directed toward it westigating and developing a lenticular screen. Accordingly, he presented a (unaddressed), dated 30 July 1968, containing such a recommendation. The instanced that this recommendation would be considered.  Subsequent discussion centered on the Corning developed testing equipment the possibility of NFIC conducting operational subjective tests on future same screens developed under this contract. The inspector will coordinate the proteons developed under this contract. The inspector will coordinate the proteons developed under this contract. The inspector will coordinate the proteons tests will not involve the expenditure of Government funds but will be accomplished during the prosecution of routine tasks.  In answer to previous queries, the inspector advised of the following:  a. A system approached by Corning would be authorized and they would be advised of the ideal time to effect coordination with the rear projection vious natures and their spolication to the present contract, were being reviews our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the minds on the items and their application to the present contract.  c. If Corning believes a rolaxation of screen specifications is require they should originate a written request for such action based on the knowledge gained by them in prosecuting the previous contract.  de Isolating the operating area in which the rear projection viewer will used may be hi	in January 1968, and the commencement of the present contribe Contractor had accomplished some further work on discrete particle scatted Screens for other Corning applications. Specifically, the scattering particle address and campide from aluminum oxide to ground glass and sample screens with sognards abnorbing and scattering layers had been fabricated but the charactering havers had been fabricated but the charactering the samples were displayed for subjective evaluation the inspector. (In the inspector's opinion, these samples were inferior to a furnished as end products under the previous contract.)  that Corning new considered that the major effort should be directed toward it wastigating and developing a lenticular screen. Accordingly, he presented a fundaddressed), dated 30 July 1968, containing such a recommendation. The instances of that this recommendation would be considered.  Subsequent discussion contered on the Corning developed testing equipment that possibility of NPIC conducting operational subjective tests on future as screens developed under this contract. Was inspector will coordinate the pretion of these tests at NPIC on a not-to-interfer basis. It is anticipated these tests will not involve the expenditure of Government funds but will be accomplished during the presention of resulme tasks.  In answer to previous queries; the inspector advised of the ideal time to effect coordination with the rear projection vicual advised of the ideal time to effect coordination with the rear projection vicual actions in their final report under the previous contract, were being reviewed our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the final report under the previous contract, were being reviewed our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the final separating area in which the rear projection viewer will used may be highly desirable in order to aid in minimizing the screen reflect but is not practical. Therefore, any rear projection screens developed under the gravity and	Contractor's plant in Raleig conducting the required peri	gh, North Caro	lina on 30 July 1966	for the purpose
these tests will not involve the expenditure of Government funds but will be accomplished during the prosecution of routine tasks.  In answer to previous queries, the inspector advised of the following:  a. A system approached by Corning would be authorized and they would be advised of the ideal time to effect coordination with the rear projection visual panufacturer.  b. The basic definitions and descriptions of the test equipment prosent Corning in their final report under the previous contract, were being reviews our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the minds on the items and their application to the present contract.  c. If Corning believes a rolaxation of screen specifications is require they should originate a written request for such action based on the knowledgeined by then in prosecuting the previous contract.  de Isolating the operating area in which the rear projection viewer will used may be highly desirable in order to aid in minimizing the screen reflect but is not practical. Therefore, any rear projection screens developed under present contract should not depend on such isolation.	these tests will not involve the expenditure of Government funds but will be accomplished during the prosecution of routine tasks.  In answer to previous queries, the inspector advised of the following:  A. A system approached by Coming would be authorized and they would be advised of the ideal time to effect coordination with the rear projection violation with the rear projection violation in their final report under the previous contract, were being reviews our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the minds on the items and their application to the present contract.  c. If Corning believes a relaxation of screen specifications is require they should originate a written request for such action based on the knowledgeined by then in prosecuting the previous contract.  dv Isolating the operating area in which the rear projection viewer will used may be highly destrable in order to aid in minimizing the screen reflect but is not practical. Therefore, any rear projection screens developed under present contract should not depend on such isolation.  e. The long range predictionaby Coming that follow-on manufacture of I cular sersons in quantity may be prohibitive due to unusual production costs be given due consideration. However, this was an unpredictable type problem aight be influenced by a number of other factors or, possibly, change with ne developed techniques.  f. Corning should submit their technical and financial reports together four weeks as they did under the previous contract (the first of these report not been received to date).  The inspector did not make any commitments relative to accepting Corning that inspector did not make any commitments relative to accepting Corning	the Contractor had accomplies screens for other Corning ap had been changed from alumin separate absorbing and scatt had not been measured. These the impector. (In the inspector is the impector of the impector of the corning now considered vestigating and developing a (unaddressed), dated 30 July advised that the Subsequent discussion of the possibility of NPIC conductors of these tests at NPIC ton of these tests at NPIC conductors of the	y 1968, and the hed some furtications. The polications were or some to greatly that the major that the major lenticular so 1968, contains recommend centered on the contract. The major that the major lenticular so 1968, contains recommend centered on the contract. The major contract.	e commencement of the her work on discrete precifically, the scale round glass and sample had been fabricated by a displayed for subjection, these samples were out contract.) It effort should be discreen. Accordingly, a ping such a recommendation would be consider to coming developed to consider the inspector will constant of the contract.	present contraparticle scatted the characted the characted inferior to the presented aution. The institute equipment on future sandinate the presented the presented the presented aution of future sandinate the presented the pr
c. If Corning believes a relaxation of screen specifications is require they should originate a written request for such action based on the knowledg gained by them in prosecuting the previous contract.  de Isolating the operating area in which the rear projection viewer will used may be highly desirable in order to aid in minimizing the screen reflect but is not practical. Therefore, any rear projection screens developed under present contract should not depend on such isolation.	c. If Corning believes a rolaxation of screen specifications is require they should originate a written request for such action based on the knowledge gained by them in prosecuting the previous contract.  der Isolating the operating area in which the rear projection viewer will used may be highly desirable in order to aid in minimizing the screen reflect but is not practical. Therefore, any rear projection screens developed under present contract should not depend on such isolation.  e. The long range predictionaby Corning that follow-on manufacture of I cular screens in quantity may be prohibitive due to unusual production costs be given due consideration. However, this was an unpredictable type problem might be influenced by a number of other factors or, possibly, change with nearly deceloped techniques.  f. Corning should submit their technical and financial reports together four weeks as they did under the previous contract (the first of these report not been received to date).  The inspector did not make any consistments relative to accepting Corning	accomplished during the pros In answer to previous q following:  a. A system approached advised of the ideal time to manufacturer  b. The basic definition corning in their final repor- our technical experts with a	ecution of requeries, the interior, the interior of the interior of the property of the proper	ntine tasks.  napector advised  ould be authorized and  ination with the rear  ptions of the test equ  revious contract, were having a meeting of the	of the they would be projection vie depose the prosent being reviews
● 報告 : 「	cular screens in quantity may be prohibitive due to unusual production costs be given due consideration. However, this was an unpredictable type problem aight be influenced by a number of other factors or, possibly, change with nearly the influenced by a number of other factors or, possibly, change with nearly the company of the financial reports together for weeks as they did under the previous contract (the first of those report not been received to date).  The inspector did not make any commitments relative to accepting corning	c. If Corning believes they should originate a writ gained by them in prosecution do Isolating the operaused may be highly desirable but is not practical. There present contract should not e. The long range pred	a rolamation then request for ing the previous ting area in a in order to fore, any real depend on such lictionaby Corr	of screen specification such action based of scentract.  which the rear project aid in minimizing the projection screens do isolation.	n the knowledg ion viewer wil screen reflect eveloped under nufacture of 1